

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 stand rejected. Claims 1-33 remain pending in this patent application. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito, U.S. Patent Number 6,002,772 (hereinafter Saito). Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 28, 29 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Monday et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,263,377 (hereinafter Monday). Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Herlin et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,915,021 (hereinafter Herlin). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Wiser et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,385,596 (hereinafter Wiser). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Saito, U.S. Patent Number 5,867,579 (hereinafter Saito '579). Claims 15, 18 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito and Monday in view of Herlin. Claims 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito and Monday in view of Wiser. Claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito and Monday in view of Saito '579.

CLAIM 1

Applicant respectfully contends that Saito fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

performing a registration process with a directory device, said registration process comprises a first client device specifying media content to download and which device is allowed to or restricted from copying said media content once downloaded to said first client device;

coupling said first client device to a media supplier to receive said media content after said performing said registration process with said directory device;

Applicant respectfully contends that Saito does not teach or suggest coupling the first client device to a media supplier to receive media content after performing the registration process with the directory device as explicitly recited in amended Claim 1. Since Saito fails to teach or suggest at least one element recited in amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Saito. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 1 is allowable over Saito.

CLAIM 13

Applicant respectfully contends that Saito and Monday, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 13.

For instance, amended Claim 13 recites in part (emphasis added):

coupling said first client device to a directory device and specifying media content to download and which device is allowed to or restricted from copying said media content once downloaded to said first client device;

supplying to said first client device a list of media suppliers for providing said media content after said specifying;

Applicant respectfully contends that Saito and Monday, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest supplying the first client device a list of media suppliers for providing said media content after the specifying explicitly recited in amended Claim 13. Since Saito and Monday, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in amended Claim 13, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended Claim 13 is not rendered obvious by Saito and Monday. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 13 is allowable over Saito and Monday.

CLAIM 24

Applicant respectfully contends that Saito and Monday, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 24.

For instance, amended Claim 24 recites in part (emphasis added):

a directory device for coupling said first client device to said media supplier and for supplying to said first client device a list of media suppliers that comprises said media supplier after said first client device specifying said media content to download and which device is allowed to or restricted from copying said media content once downloaded to said first client device;

Applicant respectfully asserts that Saito and Monday, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combined functionality of the directory device and first client device explicitly recited in amended Claim 24. Since Saito and Monday, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least one element recited in amended Claim 24, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended Claim 24 is not rendered obvious by Saito and Monday. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 24 is allowable over Saito and Monday.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-33.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: AUGUST 6, 2004



Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Voice: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069